

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
SECRETARY OF STATE
SECURITIES DEPARTMENT**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Daniel Parrilli,

Christopher Andersen,

Sundown Entertainment, Inc. and its
partners, members, officers, directors,
agents, employees, affiliates, successors
and assigns,

Bonner Productions, Inc. and its partners,
members, officers, directors, agents,
employees, affiliates, successors and
assigns.

File Number: 0900234

ORDER OF PROHIBITION

TO THE RESPONDENTS:

Daniel Parrilli
502 Yardley Drive
Carol Stream, IL 60188

Daniel Parrilli
825 North Cass Avenue, Suite 113
Westmont, IL 60559

Christopher Andersen
825 North Cass Avenue, Suite 113
Westmont, IL 60559

Christopher Andersen
520 Hamilton Avenue
Westmont, IL 60559

Christopher Andersen, c/o his attorneys
Carlos M. Rodriguez, Esq.
George Rantis, Esq.
55 W. 22nd Street, Suite 109
Lombard, IL 60148

Order of Prohibition

-2-

Sundown Entertainment, Inc.
502 Yardley Drive
Carol Stream, IL 60188

Sundown Entertainment, Inc.
825 North Cass Avenue, Suite 113
Westmont, IL 60559

Bonner Productions, Inc.
502 Yardley Drive
Carol Stream, IL 60188

WHEREAS, the above-captioned matter came on to be heard on January 27, 2010 pursuant to the Notice of Hearing dated September 10, 2009, served on the Respondents by Petitioner Secretary of State, and the record of the matter under the Illinois Securities Law of 1953 [815 ILCS 5] ("the Act") has been reviewed by the Secretary of State or his duly authorized representative.

WHEREAS, the rulings of the Hearing Officer on the admission of evidence and all motions are deemed proper and are hereby concurred with by the Secretary of State.

WHEREAS, the proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendations of the Hearing Officer, George P. Berbas, Esq., in the above captioned matter have been read and examined.

WHEREAS, the following proposed Findings of Fact of the Hearing Officer are hereby adopted as the Findings of Fact of the Secretary of State:

1. The Department served Respondents with the notice of hearing on September 12, 2009.
2. The Hearing was rescheduled and continued to December 23, 2009 for Default, and January 27, 2010 for Default Prove-up, at which time Respondents failed to appear either in person or through their attorney.
3. Respondent failed to answer or otherwise appear at the hearing in accordance with Section 130.1104, therefore,
 - a. The allegations contained in the notice of hearing and complaint are deemed admitted;
 - b. Respondents waived their right to a hearing.
 - c. Respondents are subject to an order of Default.

Order of Prohibition

-3-

4. Due notice having been given to the Respondents, the Department was allowed to proceed to a Default Hearing. The hearing included the testimony of Michael English, Securities Analyst Paul Bonoma, Investigator David Stephenson, as well as numerous documents which were offered and admitted into evidence.
5. On or about May 30, 2008, Respondent Anderson issued a promissory note in exchange for \$5,000.00 that was solicited from Michael English and borrowed to Respondent Sundown Entertainment Incorporated. The terms of the promissory note given to English stated that he would be repaid his principal with 42% interest within forty days.
6. On or about June 20, 2008, Respondent Anderson issued a second promissory note to Michael English in exchange for an additional \$10,000.00 that was solicited from English and borrowed to Sundown Entertainment Incorporated. The terms of the promissory note stated that English was to be repaid his principal plus 65% interest within thirty days.
7. Respondents told English that the funds would be used to purchase, repackage, and produce movies.
8. Respondents failed to register the promissory notes with the Illinois Secretary of State.
9. Respondents Parrilli and Anderson failed to inform English that they each had been previously convicted in Federal criminal cases.
10. Respondent Anderson failed to inform English that he had been the subject of a prior Order of Prohibition from the Illinois Secretary of State's Office precluding him from engaging in the offer or sale of securities in the State of Illinois.
11. Respondents failed to invest the funds as represented to investors.
12. Respondents failed to repay or return the funds to the Complainant in this case.

WHEREAS, the following proposed Conclusions of Law made by the Hearing Officer are correct and are hereby adopted as the Conclusions of Law of the Secretary of State:

1. The Department properly served the Notice of Hearing on the Respondents on September 12, 2009.
2. The Secretary of State has jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof pursuant to the Act.

3. Section 12.A of the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, 815 ILCS 5/1 *et. seq.*, (“the Act”) states that it shall be a violation of the provisions of this Act for any person to offer or sell any security except in accordance with the provisions of this Act.
4. Section 5 of the Act provides, *inter alia*, that all securities except those exempt under Section 3 of the Act or those being offered and sold in transactions exempt under Section 4 of the Act shall be registered with the Secretary of State prior to their offer or sale in the State of Illinois.
5. Section 12.D of the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, 815 ILCS 5/1 *et. seq.*, states that it shall be a violation of the provisions of the Act for any person to fail to file with the Secretary of State any application, report or document under the provisions of this Act or any rule or regulation made by the Secretary of State pursuant to this Act or to fail to comply with the terms of any order of the Secretary of State issued pursuant to Section 11 hereof.
6. Respondent failed to file an application for registration of the above-referenced securities with the Secretary of State and as a result, the securities were not registered pursuant to Section 5 of the Act prior to their offer or sale in the State of Illinois.
7. By virtue of the foregoing, Respondents violated Sections 12.A and 12.D of the Act.
8. Section 12.F of the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, 815 ILCS 5/1 *et. seq.*, states that it shall be a violation of the provisions of the Act for any person to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business in connection with the sale or purchase of securities which works or tends to work a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser or seller thereof.
9. Section 12.G of the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, 815 ILCS 5/1 *et. seq.*, states that it shall be a violation of the provisions of the Act for any person to obtain money or property through the sale of securities by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
10. Section 12.I of the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, 815 ILCS 5/1 *et. seq.*, states that it shall be a violation of the provisions of the Act for any person to employ any device, scheme or artifice to defraud in connection with the sale or purchase of any security, directly or indirectly.
11. Respondent’s conduct was in violation of Section 12.F, Section 12.G, and 12.I of the Act. Respondents represented that the Complainant’s funds would be used to invest in purchasing and producing movies. Respondents failed to invest the monies solicited from Complainant in the manner that was represented to Complainant. Respondents used Complainant’s money to pay prior investors, and for their own personal use and benefit. Respondents Parrilli and Anderson failed to inform Complainant of their

Order of Prohibition

-5-

prior criminal convictions. Respondent Anderson failed to inform Complainant of his prior Order of Prohibition.

12. Section 12.D of the Act provides, *inter alia*, that it shall be a violation for any person to fail to comply with the terms of any order of the Secretary of State issued pursuant to Section 11 of the Act.
13. The October 27, 1998, Order of Prohibition entered against Respondent Andersen is an order of the Secretary of State issued pursuant to Section 11 of the Act.
14. By virtue of the foregoing, Respondents violated Sections 12.A, 12.D, 12.F, 12.G, and 12.I of the Act.

WHEREAS, the Hearing Officer recommends that:


1. The Department's request for a Default judgment against the Respondents Daniel Parrilli, Christopher Anderson, Sundown Entertainment Incorporated, and Bonner Productions Incorporated is granted.
2. A permanent Order shall be entered prohibiting Respondents Daniel Parrilli, Christopher Anderson, Sundown Entertainment Incorporated, and Bonner Productions Incorporated from offering or selling securities in or from the State of Illinois.

The Secretary of State adopts the Recommendations made by the Hearing Officer in their entirety.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Department's request for a Default Judgment against Respondents **Daniel Parrilli, Christopher Andersen, Sundown Entertainment, Inc., and Bonner Productions, Inc.** is granted.
2. Pursuant to Section 11.F of the Act, Respondents **Daniel Parrilli, Christopher Andersen, Sundown Entertainment, Inc., and Bonner Productions, Inc.** and each of the Respondents' partners, members, officers and directors, agents, employees, affiliates, successors and assigns are hereby **PROHIBITED** from offering or selling any securities in or from the State of Illinois.

Dated this 12th day of March, 2010.


JESSE WHITE
Secretary of State
State of Illinois

Order of Prohibition

-6-

NOTICE: Failure to comply with the terms of this Order shall be a violation of the Section 12.D of the Act. Any person or entity who fails to comply with the terms of this Order of the Secretary of State, having knowledge of the existence of the Order, shall be guilty of a Class 4 Felony.

This is a final order subject to administrative review pursuant to the Administrative Review Law, {735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.} and the Rules and Regulations of the Illinois Securities Act, {14 Ill. Admin. Code Ch. I, Section 130.1123}. Any action for Judicial Review must be commenced within thirty-five (35) days from the date a copy of this Order is served upon the party seeking review.